arXiv:1403.7916v2 [math.CO] 3 Apr 2014

Ornated Graphs

(Johan Kok)[1]

Abstract

The area of study focuses on a new family of finite non-simple directed graphs. A member of the family of these directed graphs denoted by $O_n(a_1, a_2, a_3, ..., a_l), a_i \in \mathbb{N}_0, n \in \mathbb{N}$ is conceptualised as a graph having all vertices $\{v_i | i \in \mathbb{N}, i \leq n\}$ consecutively seated clockwise on the circumference of a circle and constructed from an ordered string $s_l = s(a_i | a_i \in \mathbb{N}_0, i \leq l, i, l \in \mathbb{N})$ by arcing in such a way that for entries a_t, t uneven, a tail v_i has *clockwise* heads v_j if and only if $(i + a_t) \geq j$ and for entries a_s, s even, a tail v_i has *anticlockwise* heads v_j if and only if $(i - a_s) \leq j$. It is meant to be an *introductory paper* to encourage exploratory research.

Keywords: Ornated graph, Kyle graph, Directed graph, Symmetric graph, Degree sequence

AMS Classification Numbers: 05C07, 05C12, 05C20

1 Introduction

Consider the ordered string $s_l = s(a_i | a_i \in \mathbb{N}_0 \ , i \leq l, i, l \in \mathbb{N}) = (a_1, a_2, a_3, ..., a_l)$. For any entry of the ordered string say a_t, t is called the indice of a_t. Furthermore a graph G_1 is said to be larger or equal in size, than graph G_2 if and only if $\nu(G_1) \geq \nu(G_2)$. When we refer to the degree of a vertex, $d(v_i)$ in a directed Graph G, we explicitly refer to the degree found in the underlying graph denoted $\underline{G}$, hence $d(v_i) = d^+(v_i) + d^-(v_i)$. So by convention $\Delta(O_n(a_1, a_2, a_3, ..., a_l) = \Delta(\underline{O}_n(a_1, a_2, a_3, ..., a_l)$ and $\delta(O_n(a_1, a_2, a_3, ..., a_l) = \delta(\underline{O}_n(a_1, a_2, a_3, ..., a_l)$ and so on for other vertex degree, $d(v_i)$.

Definition 1.1. *The family of finite Ornated Graphs denoted by* $\{O_n(a_1, a_2, a_3, ..., a_l) | a_i \in \mathbb{N}_0 \ , n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ *is defined by* $V(O_n(a_1, a_2, a_3, ..., a_l)) = \{v_i | i \in \mathbb{N}, i \leq n\}$, $E(O_n(a_1, a_2, a_3, ..., a_l)) \subseteq \{(v_i, v_j) | i, j \in \mathbb{N}\}$ *and* $(v_i, v_j) \in E(O_n(a_1, a_2, a_3, ..., a_l))$ *if and only* $(v_i, v_j) \in \{(v_i, v_j) | \forall t, uneven\ indices, (i + a_t) \geq j, i < j\} \cup \{(v_i, v_j) | \forall s, evenindices, (i - a_s) \leq j, i > j\}$.

[1]**Affiliation of authors:**
Johan Kok (Tshwane Metropolitan Police Department), City of Tshwane, Republic of South Africa
e-mail: kokkiek2@tshwane.gov.za

Lemma 1.1. *For the Ornated Graph $O_n(a_1, a_2, a_3)$ we have that:*

(i) $O_n(a_1, a_2, a_3) = O_n(a_1, 0, 0) + O_n(0, a_2, a_3) = O_n(0, a_2, 0) + O_n(a_1, 0, a_3) = O_n(0, 0, a_3) + O_n(a_1, a_2, 0)$, *the associative law,*

(ii) $O_n(a_1, a_2, a_3) = O_n(a_1, 0, 0) + O_n(0, a_2, 0) + O_n(0, 0, a_3)$, *the summation law,*

and for the Ornated Graph $O_n(a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4)$ we have that:

(iii) $O_n(a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4) = O_n(a_3, a_2, a_1, a_4) = O_n(a_1, a_4, a_3, a_2) = O_n(a_3, a_4, a_1, a_2)$, *the commutative law,*

(iv) If $s_m = (b_1, b_2, b_3, ..., b_m)$ is an ordered string reduced from $s_l = (a_1, a_2, a_3, ..., a_l)$ by removing all the zero entries from s_l then $\underline{O}_n(a_1, a_2, a_3, ..., a_l) = \underline{O}_n(b_1, b_2, b_3, ..., b_m)$, the redundancy law.

Proof. (i)From definition 1.1 it follows that $O_n(a_1, 0, 0)$ has edges $(v_i, v_j) \in E(O_n(a_1, a_2, a_3))$ if and only $(v_i, v_j) \in \{(v_i, v_j) | (i + a_1) \geq j, i < j\}$. By same definition the Ornated Graph $O_n(0, a_2, a_3)$ has edges $(v_i, v_j) \in E(O_n(a_1, a_2, a_3))$ if and only $(v_i, v_j) \in \{(v_i, v_j) | (i + a_3) \geq j, i < j\} \cup \{(v_i, v_j) | (i - a_2) \leq j, i > j\}$. Clearly then $E(O_n(a_1, a_2, a_3)) = E(O_n(a_1, 0, 0)) \cup E(O_n(0, a_2, a_3))$.

So it follows that $V(O_n(a_1, a_2, a_3)) = V(O_n(a_1, 0, 0)) \cup V(O_n(0, a_2, a_3)) = V(O_n(a_1, 0, 0) + O_n(0, a_2, a_3))$ and $E(O_n(a_1, a_2, a_3)) = E(O_n(a_1, 0, 0)) \cup E(O_n(0, a_2, a_3)) = E(O_n(a_1, 0, 0) + O_n(0, a_2, a_3))$ and the result follows.

All other results $((ii), (iii)$ *and* $(iv))$ follow in similar fashion. □

Corollary 1.2. *Part 1: Provided that the number of vertices and the values of even indiced and uneven indiced entries respectively, remain equal and disregarding the positions of the even indiced, except that they remain even indiced and disregarding the positions of the uneven indiced, except that they remain uneven indiced, the number of ordered strings $(a_1, a_2, a_3, ..., a_l)$ with $l = m + t$ entries (with m the number of even indiced entries and t the number of uneven indiced entries respectively), that construct identical Ornated Graphs, is given by $m!t!$ and,*

Part 2: If the number of vertices and the values of even indiced and uneven indiced entries respectively, remain equal, and the positions of the entries (even or uneven indiced) are disregarded then the number of ordered strings that construct identical underlying Ornated

Graphs is given by l!

Proof. Trivial. □

Definition 1.2. *Consider the ordered string* $s_l = (a_1, a_2, a_3, ..., a_l)$.
If entry $a_t = min\{a_1, a_2, a_3, ..., a_l\}$, *the ordered string* $s_{l_1} = (b_1, b_2, b_3, ..., b_{l_1})$ *after removing all entries* a_t, *is called the reduced degree-string in respect of* $(a_1, a_2, a_3, ..., a_l)$. *Recursively the reduced degree-string* $s_{l_2} = (c_1, c_2, c_3, ..., c_{l_2})$ *in respect of* $(b_1, b_2, b_3, ..., b_{l_1})$ *can be found. The smallest reduced degree-string is always the string* $(a_q, a_q, a_q, ..., a_q), a_q = max(a_1, a_2, a_3, ..., a_l)$.

2 Kyle Graphs

Lemma 2.1. *The smallest finite Ornated Graph to attain* $\Delta(O_n(a_1, a_2, a_3, ..., a_l)) = 2(\sum_{i=1}^{l} a_i)$ *at a single vertex can be constructed on* $n = 2k+1$ *vertices with* $k = a_q = max\{a_1, a_2, a_3, ..., a_l\}$.

Proof. Because $2k + 1, k = a_q = max\{a_1, a_2, a_3, ..., a_l\}$ is always an unique uneven number and therefore $d(v_{\lceil \frac{1}{2}(2k+1) \rceil})$ is unique, the vertex v_{k+1} can be considered the unique midway ("central") vertex of the Ornated Graph $O_{n=2k+1}(a_1, a_2, a_3, ..., a_l)$.

Clearly, beginning with the edgeless graph on $2k + 1$ vertices and without loss of generality let r be an uneven indice, and then linking only the edges $\{(v_i, v_j)|(i+a_r) \geq j, i < j\}, a_r \leq k$, we have $\Delta(O_{n=2k+1}(0, 0, 0, ..., a_r, ..., 0)) = 2a_r$. Let t recursively be set at the values $t = a_m$, and $m = 1, 2, 3, ..., (r-1), (r+1), ..., l$. Thus by linking the edges $\{(v_i, v_j)|(i+t) \geq j, i < j\}$ (uneven indice) and $\{(v_i, v_j)|(i-t) \leq j, i > j\}$ (even indice) through recursion, it follows that $\Delta(O_{n=2k+1}(a_1, a_2, a_3, ..., a_l)) = 2(\sum_{i=1}^{l} a_i)$, uniquely at vertex v_{k+1}. □

Definition 2.1. *The smallest Ornated Graph resulting from Lemma 2.1 is called the Kyle Graph of the family of finite Ornated Graphs* $\{O_n(a_1, a_2, a_3, ..., a_l)|a_i \in \mathbb{N}_0 \ , n \in \mathbb{N}\}$.

Corollary 2.2. *Consider the family of Ornated Graphs* $\{O_n(a_1, a_2, a_3, ..., a_l)|a_i \in \mathbb{N}_0 \ , n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ *and let* $k = a_q = max\{a_1, a_2, a_3, ..., a_l\}$. *Then the Ornated Graph* $O_{(2k+1)+r}(a_1, a_2, a_3, ..., a_l), r \in \mathbb{N}_0$, *has exactly* $(r + 1)$ *vertices with degree* $= \Delta(O_{n=(2k+1)+r}(a_1, a_2, a_3, ..., a_l)) = 2(\sum_{i=1}^{l} a_i)$.

Proof. Lemma 2.1 assures that vertex v_{k+1} has degree $d(v_{k+1}) = \Delta(O_{n=(2k+1)}(a_1, a_2, a_3, ..., a_l)) = 2(\sum_{i=1}^{l} a_i)$.

Now consider $O_{(2k+1)+1}(a_1, a_2, a_3, ..., a_l)$. Note that vertex v_{k+1} serves as the central vertex in respect of vertices $v_1, v_2, v_3, ..v_k$ in applying definition 1.1 for all *uneven indices*. It also serves as the central vertex for vertices $v_{k+2}, v_{k+3}, ..., v_{2k}$ in applying definition 1.1 to for all *even indices*. Hence, $d(v_{k+1}) = \Delta(O_{n=(2k+1)+1}(a_1, a_2, a_3, ..., a_l)) = 2(\sum_{i=1}^{l} a_i)$.

Similarly vertex v_{k+2} serves as the central vertex in respect of vertices $v_{k+3}, v_{k+4}, ..v_{2k+1}$ in applying definition 1.1 for all *even indices*. It also serves as central vertex for vertices $v_2, v_3, ..., v_{k+1}$ in applying definition 1.1 for all *uneven indices*. Hence, $d(v_{k+2}) = \Delta(O_{n=(2k+1)+1}(a_1, a_2, a_3, ..., a_l)) = 2(\sum_{i=1}^{l} a_i)$.

So $d(v_{k+1}) = d(v_{k+2}) = \Delta(O_{n=(2k+1)+1}(a_1, a_2, a_3, ..., a_l)) = 2(\sum_{i=1}^{l} a_i)$. Recursively the result follows for $O_{(2k+1)+r}(a_1, a_2, a_3, ..., a_l), r \in \mathbb{N}_0$. □

Definition 2.2. *The set of vertices in the Ornated Graph $O_{n=(2k+1)+r}(a_1, a_2, a_3, ..., a_l), r \in \mathbb{N}_0$, with degree $= \Delta(O_n(a_1, a_2, a_3, ..., a_l))$ is called the central cluster of the Ornated Graph and denoted, $\mathbb{C}(O_n(a_1, a_2, a_3, ..., a_l))$.*

Lemma 2.3. *For all Ornated Graphs from the family of finite Ornated Graphs $\{O_n(a_1, a_2, a_3, ..., a_l) | a_i \in \mathbb{N}_0 , n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ which are larger or equal in size to the Kyle Graph of the family, we have that for only v_1 and v_n, $d(v_1) = d(v_n) = \delta(O_n(a_1, a_2, a_3, ..., a_l)) = \sum_{i=1}^{l} a_i$.*

Proof. The proof that $d(v_1) = d(v_n) = \delta(O_n(a_1, a_2, a_3, ..., a_l)) = \sum_{i=1}^{l} a_i$. follows similary to the proof of Lemma 2.1.

Assume there exists another vertex v_j with $d(v_j) = \delta(O_n(a_1, a_2, a_3, ..., a_l))$. Also assume, without loss of generality, that $1 < j < m, m$ the smallest indice with $v_m \in \mathbb{C}$. Beginning with the edgeless graph and linking the edges of an entry say, a_t it follows that $d(v_2) = d(v_1) + 1$ in the subgraph of the Ornated Graph. It also follows that $d(v_2) \leq d(v_3) \leq d(v_4) \leq .... \leq d(v_j).... \leq d(v_m)$. The latter holds true as the linkages for all entries are added resulting in $d(v_1) < d(v_2) < d(v_3) < d(v_4) < .... < d(v_j).... < d(v_m) = \Delta(O_n(a_1, a_2, a_3, ..., a_l))$. This is a contradiction to the assumption that $d(v_j) = \delta(O_n(a_1, a_2, a_3, ..., a_l))$. □

Corollary 2.4. *From Corollary 2.2 and Lemma 2.3 it follows that for all Ornated Graphs from the family of finite Ornated Graphs* $\{O_n(a_1, a_2, a_3, ..., a_l)|a_i \in \mathbb{N}_0 \ , n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ *which are larger or equal in size to the Kyle Graph of the family, we have that* $2\delta(O_n(a_1, a_2, a_3, ..., a_l) = \Delta(O_n(a_1, a_2, a_3, ..., a_l)$.

Proof. Since $\delta(O_n(a_1, a_2, a_3, ..., a_l)) = \sum_{i=1}^{l} a_i.$ always, and $\Delta(O_{n=(2k+1)+r}(a_1, a_2, a_3, ..., a_l)) = 2(\sum_{i=1}^{l} a_i)$ always, for an Ornated Graph on at least $2k+1, k = max\{a_1, a_2, a_3, ..., a_l\}$ vertices it follows easily that $2\delta(O_n(a_1, a_2, a_3, ..., a_l) = \Delta(O_n(a_1, a_2, a_3, ..., a_l)$. □

Theorem 2.5. *For the Kyle Graph,* $O_{2k+1}(a_1, a_2, a_3, ..., a_l), k = a_q = max\{a_1, a_2, a_3, ..., a_l\}$ *and* $a_i \geq 1, \forall i$ *the degree sequence is given by:*

$$d(v_1) = \sum_{i=1}^{l} a_i, \underbrace{d(v_2) = \sum_{i=1}^{l} a_i + l, d(v_3) = \sum_{i=1}^{l} a_i + 2l, ...d(v_{h_1+1}) = \sum_{i=1}^{l} a_i + h_1 l,}_{h_1 = min(a_1, a_2, a_3, ..., a_l), vertices}$$

$$\underbrace{d(v_{(h_1+2)}) = (\sum_{i=1}^{l} a_i + h_1 l) + l_1, d(v_{(h_1+3)}) = (\sum_{i=1}^{l} a_i + h_1 l) + 2l_1, ...d(v_{(h_2-h_1)}) =}_{(h_2-h_1)vertices, h_2 = 2^{nd} min(a_1, a_2, a_3, ..., a_l)}$$

$$\underbrace{(\sum_{i=1}^{l} a_i + h_1 l) + (h_2 - h_1) l_1}_{(h_2-h_1)vertices, h_2 = 2^{nd} min(a_1, a_2, a_3, ..., a_l)} \quad .$$

... and recursively so on for sequential reduced degree-strings until

$$\underbrace{d(v_{k_1+2}) = 2(\sum_{i=1}^{l} a_i) - ((k - k_1) - 1), ..., d(v_k) = 2(\sum_{i=1}^{l} a_i) - 1, d(v_{k+1}) = 2(\sum_{i=1}^{l} a_i),}_{(k-k_1)vertices, k_1 = 2^{nd} max(a_1, a_2, a_3, ..., a_l)}$$

with v_{k+1} *being central, then recursively "mirror image" degree values follow,*

...,

$$\underbrace{d(v_{(2k+1)-(h_1-1)}) = \sum_{i=1}^{l} a_i + (h_1 - 1)l, d(v_{(2k+1)-(h_1-2)}) = \sum_{i=1}^{l} a_i + (h_1 - 2)l, ..., d(v_{2k+1}) = \sum_{i=1}^{l} a_i}_{h_1 = min(a_1, a_2, a_3, ..., a_l), vertices} .$$

Proof. We will prove the result for vertices $v_1, v_2, v_3, ...v_{k+1}$ since the mirror image of the degree sequence then follows from definition 1.1.

Consider the ordered string $s_l = (a_1, a_2, a_3, ..., a_l)$. Since the degree sequence of the Kyle Graph, $O_{2k+1}(a_1, a_2, a_3, ..., a_l), k = a_q = max\{a_1, a_2, a_3, ..., a_l\}$ is identical to the degree sequence of the underlying Kyle Graph we use the second part of Corollary 1.2 and consider the ordered string $(b_1, b_2, b_3, ..., b_l)$ such that $b_1 \geq b_2 \geq b_3 \geq, ..., \geq b_l$ and $b_i = a_j$ for at least one value of j. That $d(v_1) = \sum_{i=1}^{l} b_i$ follows from Lemma 2.3.

Consider the reduced string $s_1 = (b_1)$. From definition 1.1 it follows easily that for the underlying Kyle Graph, $\underline{O}_{(2b_1+1)}(b_1)$ we have that $d(v_1) = b_1 = \sum_{i=1}^{1} b_i$. Since $h_1 = b_1$ and $l = 1$ it follows from definition 1.1 that $d(v_2) = b_1 + 1 = \sum_{i=1}^{1} b_i + l, d(v_3) = d(v_2) + 1 = b_1 + 2.1 = \sum_{i=1}^{1} b_i + 2l, ..., d(v_{b_1+1}) = d(v_{b_1}) + 1 = b_1 + b_1.1 = \sum_{i=1}^{1} b_i + h_1 l$. So the result holds for $\underline{O}_{(2b_1+1)}(b_1)$.

Case 1: Consider the reduced string $s_2 = (b_1, b_2), b_1 = b_2$. It follows that for the underlying Kyle Graph, $\underline{O}_{(2b_1+1)}(b_1, b_2)$ we have that $d(v_1) = 2b_1 = 2(\sum_{i=1}^{1} b_i) = \sum_{i=1}^{2} b_i$. It also follows that since $h_1 = b_2$ and $l = 2$ for this case, we have $d(v_2) = 2(b_1 + 1) = 2(\sum_{i=1}^{1} b_i + 1) = 2(b_2 + 1) = \sum_{i=1}^{2} b_i + 2 = \sum_{i=1}^{2} b_i + l, d(v_3) = 2(d(v_2) + 1) = 2(b_1 + 2) = 2(\sum_{i=1}^{1} b_i + 2) = 2(b_2 + 2) = \sum_{i=1}^{2} b_i + 4 = \sum_{i=1}^{2} b_i + 2l, ..., d(v_{b_1+1}) = 2(d(v_{b_1}) + 1) = 2(b_1 + b_1) = 2(\sum_{i=1}^{1} b_i + b_1) = 2(b_2 + b_2) = 2\sum_{i=1}^{1} b_i + 2b_2 = \sum_{i=1}^{2} b_i + h_1 l$. So the result holds for $\underline{O}_{(2b_1+1)}(b_1, b_2), b_1 = b_2$.

Case 2: Consider the reduced string $s_2 = (b_1, b_2), b_1 > b_2$. Let $b_1 - b_2 = t$. Definition 1.1 allows the underlying graph of $O_{2b_1+1}(0, b_2)$ to have degree sequence $d(v_1) = b_2, d(v_2) = b_2 + 1, d(v_3) = b_2 + 2, .., d(v_{(2b_1+1)-t}) = b_2 + b_2 = 2b_2$. Thereafter for $j = 1, 2, 3, ..., t$ we have $d(v_{(2b_1+1)-(t-j)}) = 2b_2$. So it follows that the underlying graph of $O_{2b_1+1}(b_1, b_2)$ has degree sequence, $d(v_1) = \sum_{i=1}^{2} b_i, d(v_2) = \sum_{i=1}^{2} b_i + 2, d(v_3) = \sum_{i=1}^{2} b_i + 4, ..., d(v_{(2b_1+1)-t}) = \sum_{i=1}^{2} b_i + 2b_2$. Thereafter for $j = 1, 2, 3, ..., t$ we have $d(v_{(2b_1+1)-(t-j)}) = \sum_{i=1}^{2} b_i + j$. So because $h_1 = b_2$ and $l = 2$ for vertices $i = 1, 2, 3, ..., (2b_1 - t)$ whereafter for the subsequent t vertices, $l_1 = 1$ the

result:

$$d(v_1) = \sum_{i=1}^{l} a_i, \underbrace{d(v_2) = \sum_{i=1}^{l} a_i + l, d(v_3) = \sum_{i=1}^{l} a_i + 2l, ...d(v_{h_1+1}) = \sum_{i=1}^{l} a_i + h_1 l,}_{h_1 = min(a_1,a_2,a_3,...,a_l), vertices}$$

$$\underbrace{d(v_{(h_1+2)}) = (\sum_{i=1}^{l} a_i + h_1 l) + l_1, d(v_{(h_1+3)}) = (\sum_{i=1}^{l} a_i + h_1 l) + 2l_1, ...d(v_{(h_2-h_1)}) =}_{(h_2-h_1)vertices, h_2 = 2^{nd} min(a_1,a_2,a_3,...,a_l)}$$

$$\underbrace{(\sum_{i=1}^{l} a_i + h_1 l) + (h_2 - h_1) l_1}_{(h_2-h_1)vertices, h_2 = 2^{nd} min(a_1,a_2,a_3,...,a_l)}$$

... and recursively so on for sequential reduced degree-strings until

$$\underbrace{d(v_{k_1+2}) = 2(\sum_{i=1}^{l} a_i) - ((k-k_1)-1), ..., d(v_k) = 2(\sum_{i=1}^{l} a_i) - 1, d(v_{k+1}) = 2(\sum_{i=1}^{l} a_i),}_{(k-k_1)vertices, k_1 = 2^{nd} max(a_1,a_2,a_3,...,a_l)}$$

with v_{k+1} being central, then recursively "mirror image" degree values follow, follows.

Recursively the result follows for the underlying graphs of:
$O_{2b_1+1}(b_1, b_2, b_3), O_{2b_1+1}(b_1, b_2, b_3, b_4), ..., O_{2b_1+1}(b_1, b_2, b_3, ..., b_l)$. □

Example: For the Kyle Graph $O_{17}(1, 3, 5, 1, 2, 8)$ the degree sequence is given by $d(v_1) = 20, d(v_2) = 26, d(v_3) = 30, d(v_4) = 33, d(v_5) = 35, d(v_6) = 37, d(v_7) = 38, d(v_8) = 39, d(v_9) = 40, d(v_{10}) = 39, d(v_{11}) = 38, d(v_{12}) = 37, d(v_{13}) = 35, d(v_{14}) = 33, d(v_{15}) = 30, d(v_{16}) = 26,$ and $d(v_{17}) = 20$. Let the notation $d(v_i) \rightsquigarrow a_j$ for illustrative purposes, denote $d(v_i)$ in $O_n(0, 0, 0, ..a_j, .., 0)$. The degree sequence can easily be calculated by using the summation law (Lemma 1.1 (ii)). See the table below:

v_i	$d(v_i) \rightsquigarrow a_1$	$d(v_i) \rightsquigarrow a_2$	$d(v_i) \rightsquigarrow a_3$	$d(v_i) \rightsquigarrow a_4$	$d(v_i) \rightsquigarrow a_5$	$d(v_i) \rightsquigarrow a_6$	$d(v_i)$
v_1	1	3	5	1	2	8	20
v_2	2	4	6	2	3	9	26
v_3	2	5	7	2	4	10	30
v_4	2	6	8	2	4	11	33
v_5	2	6	9	2	4	12	35
v_6	2	6	10	2	4	13	37
v_7	2	6	10	2	4	14	38
v_8	2	6	10	2	4	15	39
v_9	2	6	10	2	4	16	40
v_{10}	2	6	10	2	4	15	39
v_{11}	2	6	10	2	4	14	38
v_{12}	2	6	10	2	4	13	37
v_{13}	2	6	9	2	4	12	35
v_{14}	2	6	8	2	4	11	33
v_{15}	2	5	7	2	4	10	30
v_{16}	2	4	6	2	3	9	26
v_{17}	1	3	5	1	2	8	20

Note the "mirror image" degree sequence with v_9 being central to the degree sequence.

Corollary 2.6. *The number of edges of the Kyle Graph is simply* $\epsilon = \frac{1}{2}\sum$*(all terms of Theorem 2.5).*

Proof. See Theorem 1.1 of [1]. □

3 Determining the Ornated Graph

Definition 3.1. *Consider vertices* v_i *and* v_{i+1} *of an Ornated Graph. The relative in-, and outdegree of* v_i *denoted by* $d_r^-(v_i)$ *and* $d_r^+(v_i)$ *respectively, are define to be the number of* (v_{i+1}, v_i) *and* (v_i, v_{i+1}) *edges, respectively.*

Proposition 3.1. *If, for a vertex* $v_i, i < n$ *in an Ornated Graph,* $O_n(a_1, a_2, a_3, ..., a_l)$ *which is larger or equal to the Kyle Graph, we have that* $d_r^-(v_i) = m$ *and* $d_r^+(v_i) = t$ *then the ordered string has* $m + t$ *entries composed of* m *even indiced entries and* t *uneven indiced entries.*

Proof. Construct the Ornated Graph $O_n(a_1, a_2, a_3, ..., a_l), l = m + t$ with m the number of even indiced entries and t the number of uneven indiced entries, by beginning with the edgeless graph on n vertices and linking first, the edges $\{(v_i, v_j)|(i + a_1) \geq j, i < j\}$. Clearly we have that $d_r^+(v_i) = 1$, for $i = 1, 2, 3, ..., n - 1$. By recursively adding the linkage of edges $\{(v_i, v_j)|(i + a_s) \geq j, i < j\}$ for all, say t uneven indiced entries, we have that $d_r^+(v_i) = t$ for $i = 1, 2, 3, ..., n - 1$.

By applying definition 1.1 for all, say m even indices entries,the result $d_r^-(v_i) = t$ for $i = 1, 2, 3, ..., n - 1$ follows similarly. □

Theorem 3.2. *(Ratanang's Theorem): For a Kyle Graph with $m \times m$ adjacency matrix*

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & e_{12} & \dots & e_{1m} \\ e_{21} & 0 & \dots & e_{2m} \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ e_{m1} & e_{m2} & \dots & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

with each entry e_{ij} equal to the number of edges (v_i, v_j), the ordered string defining the Ornated Graph $O_n(s_l), n \geq m$, is given by $s_l = (a_1, a_2, a_3, ..., a_l)$ such that $a_1 < a_2 < a_3 < ... < a_l, l = (e_{i(i+1)} + e_{(i+1)i}), i \leq (m - 1)$ and $a_1, a_2, a_3, ..., a_l = \lfloor \frac{m}{2} \rfloor$ can all be determined.

Proof. The result $l = (e_{i(i+1)} + e_{(i+1)i}), i \leq (m - 1)$ follows directly from Proposition 3.1.

Consider the adjacency matrix of the Kyle Graph,

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & e_{12} & \dots & e_{1m} \\ e_{21} & 0 & \dots & e_{2m} \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ e_{m1} & e_{m2} & \dots & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Without loss of generality we assume that the defining ordered string $s_l = (a_1, a_2, a_3, ..., a_l)$ has uneven number of entries. Consider row $(e_{1j}), 1 \leq j \leq m$ (row 1) and count the number of entries $e_{1j} \geq 1, (1 < j \leq m)$, say q. From definition 1.1 it follows that $a_l = q = \lfloor \frac{m}{2} \rfloor$.

Now consider the deviated matrix where we subtract 1 from each first row entry, $e_{1j} \geq 1, (1 < j \leq m)$. Consider row 1 of the deviated matrix and count the number of entries $e_{1j}^* \geq 1, (1 < j \leq m)$, say t. From definition 1.1 it follows that $a_{(l-2)} = t$. Recursively all entries $a_1, a_3, a_5, ..., a_l$ can be determined.

Now consider the column $(e_{j1}), 1 \leq j \leq m$, (column 1) and count the number of entries

$e_{j1} \geq 1, (1 < j \leq m)$, say t. From definition 1.1 it follows that $a_{l-1} = t$. Now consider the deviated matrix where we subtract 1 from each first column entry, $e_{j1} \geq 1, (1 < j \leq m)$. Consider column 1 of the deviated matrix and count the number of entries $e^*_{j1} \geq 1, (1 < j \leq m)$, say w. From definition 1.1 it follows that $a_{(l-3)} = w$. Recursively all entries $a_2, a_4, a_6, ..., a_{l-1}$ can be determined.

Because adding and subtraction $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}$ is well-defined, the proof is well-defined. □

Corollary 3.3. *For any vertex v_i in an Ornated Graph, $d(v_i) = \sum_{j=1}^{n} e_{ij} + \sum_{j=1}^{n} e_{ji}$, with e_{ij}, e_{ji} the corresponding entries in the $n \times n$ adjacency matrix.*

Proof. Because $d^+(v_i) = \sum_{j=1}^{n} e_{ij}$ and $d^-(v_i) = \sum_{j=1}^{n} e_{ji}$ the result $d(v_i) = d^+(v_i) + d^-(v_i) = \sum_{j=1}^{n} e_{ij} + \sum_{j=1}^{n} e_{ji}$, follows easily. □

Definition 3.2. *If the vertices of a directed graph G on n vertices can be numbered such that $d^+(v_1) \leq d^+(v_2) \leq ... \leq d^+(v_i) \leq d^+(v_{i+1}) = ... = d^+(v_{i+j})_{j-1 \geq 0}, \geq d^+(v_{n-(i-1)}) \geq d^+(v_{n-(i-2)}) \geq ... \geq d^+(v_n)$ and $d^-(v_1) \leq d^-(v_2) \leq ... \leq d^-(v_i) \leq d^-(v_{i+1}) = ... = d^-(v_{i+j})_{j-1 \geq 0}, \geq d^-(v_{n-(i-1)}) \geq d^-(v_{n-(i-2)}) \geq ... \geq d^-(v_n)$ then G is called a symmetric directed graph.*

Theorem 3.4. *For a symmetric directed graph consider the corresponding adjacency matrix,*

$$\begin{pmatrix} e_{11} & e_{12} & \dots & e_{1m} \\ e_{21} & e_{21} & \dots & e_{2m} \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ e_{m1} & e_{m2} & \dots & e_{mm} \end{pmatrix}.$$

A symmetric graph is a Kyle Graph if and only if:

(i) m is uneven and $m = 2a_l + 1, a_l$ as determined by Theorem 3.2 and;
(ii) $e_{ii} = 0, \forall i$ and;
(iii) $e_{i(i+1)} + e_{(i+1)i} = e_{j(j+1)} + e_{(j+1)j}, 1 \leq i, j \leq (m-1)$ and;
(iv) For row (e_{1m}) we have $e_{12} \geq e_{13} \geq ... \geq e_{1\lfloor \frac{m}{2} \rfloor} = 1$ and $e_{1j} = 0, \lfloor \frac{m}{2} \rfloor + 1 \leq j \leq m$ and;
(v) For column (e_{m1}) we have $e_{21} = 1 = e_{31} = 1, ..., 1 = e_{(\lfloor \frac{m}{2} \rfloor - 1)1}$ and $e_{j1} = 0, \lfloor \frac{m}{2} \rfloor \leq j \leq m$.

Proof. (i) m uneven follows directly from Lemma 2.1.
(ii) Since no loops are defined by definition 1.1 it follows that $e_{ii} = 0, \forall i$.

(*iii*) (conjectured)
(*iv*) (conjectured)
(*v*) (conjectured)

□

[Open problem: Conclude the proof of Theorem 3.4]
[Open problem: Find the values of $d^+(v_i)$ and $d^-(v_i)$ for the Ornated Graph, $O_n(a_1, a_2, a_3, ..., a_l)$ for $i \in \{1, 2, 3, ..., n\}$ in general.]
[Open problem: Generalise Ratanang's Theorem allowing ordered strings such that $a_1 \leq a_2 \leq a_3 \leq ... \leq a_l$. Now repetition and more entry values are possible. So for example, $(1, 3, 5, 6)$ can become $(1, 1, 2, 3, 4, 4, 4, 4, ..., 4, 5, 5, 6, 6, 6, ..., a_l = 6), 1 \leq a_i \leq 6, i \leq l$.]
[Open problem: Given the degree sequence $d(v_1), d(v_2), d(v_3), ..., d(v_m)$ of a Kyle Graph, is it possible to determine an ordered string s_l so that $O_n(s_l)$ obtains the exact degree sequence? At least it is obvious that $\nu(O_n(s_l)) = m$ and that, $a_l = \lfloor \frac{m}{2} \rfloor$.]

Open access: This paper is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License which permits any use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author(s) and the source are credited.

Reference

[1] Bondy, J.A., Murty, U.S.R., *Graph Theory with Applications,* Macmillan Press, London, 1976.

Acknowledgement will be given to colleagues for preliminary peer review and other contributions on the content of this paper during the preprint arXiv publication term:[2]

[2]